



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,774	11/08/2000	Alessandro Sette	18623006240	3936

20350 7590 07/02/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

DECLoux, AMY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/709,774

Applicant(s)

SETTE ET AL.

Examin r

Amy M. DeCloux

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 18-65 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachm nt(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's sequence amendment filed 4-23-02 (Paper No. 8) is acknowledged and has been entered. The instant application appears to be in sequence compliance.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 18-26, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein, classified in class 435, subclass 26.1.
- II. Claims 27-34, drawn to a method of synthesizing a fusion protein, classified in class 436, subclass 69.1.
- III. Claims 35-42 and 60-65, drawn to fusion protein and compositions thereof, classified in class 424, subclass 192.1 and class 514, subclass 8.
- IV. Claims 43-51, drawn to a method of inducing an immune response in a human comprising administering a composition of claim 18, classified in class 424, subclass 184.1.
- V. Claims 52-59, drawn to a method of inducing an immune response in a human comprising administering a composition of claim 35, classified in class 424, subclass 184.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Groups II, IV and V, are unique methods because the endpoints of group II and of Groups IV and V are distinct. Though the endpoint of Groups IV and V are identical, each group comprises different method steps, the former comprising the administration of a polynucleotide, while the latter comprises the administration of a fusion protein. Therefore, Groups II, IV and V are patentably distinct, each from the other.

Groups I and III are unique products. The products differ with respect to their makeup, the former comprising a polynucleotide, the latter comprising a protein. Since protein and a polynucleotide differ with respect to their structure and biochemical /physicochemical properties, Groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Group I and Groups IV, are related as product and process of use, as are Group III and Group V. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. 806.05(h)). In the present case, the product as claimed, the fusion protein and the polynucleotide, can be used as a ligand in a process of affinity purification, as well as in a method of inducing an immune response.

Art Unit: 1644

Group II and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product, the fusion protein, can be made using synthetic methods of chemical synthesis as well as by recombinant molecular genetics.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and because a search in the non-patent literature of any of these distinct inventions would not be co-extensive with a search of the others, an examination and search of two or more inventions in a single application would constitute a serious undue burden on the Examiner, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A) a fusion protein.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Specifically, regardless of which group is elected applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a method or a product comprising a specific fusion protein or a polynucleotide comprising said specific fusion protein, wherein A) the pan DR component of said s specific fusion protein is specifically defined , meaning that each residue of R1 to R5 is defined by a specific residue or a specific sequence of specific residues, and the exact number and composition of said pan Drs is defined, and B) the remaining part of the fusion protein is defined by a specific component such as a specific immunogenic peptide or a specific native protein fragment or a specific particle as recited in claim 1.

The species are distinct each from the other for the following reasons:

A) the pan DR sequences differ with respect to their biochemical structure and function,

B) the second components of said fusion protein differ with respect to their biochemical structure and function

Currently, claims 18-65 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

Art Unit: 1644

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy M. DeCloux whose telephone number is 703 306-5821. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 703 308-3973. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3014 for regular communications and 703 305-7401 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0196.

Amy DeCloux, PhD
Patent Examiner, Group 1640
June 30, 2002

Amz DeCloux
7-1-02